REMARKS

In response to the Office Action mailed June 24, 2003, Applicants amend their application and request reconsideration. No claims are cancelled in this Amendment and new claims 11-20 are added so that claims 1-20 are now pending. Claims 4, 5, and 7-10 have been withdrawn from consideration because of a species election requirement and an election. Claim 1 is a generic claim as to those withdrawn claims just as new claim 11 is generic as to claims 12-20.

New claims 11-20 are based upon original claims 1-10. In fact, many of the dependent claims are identical in their limitations, with only differences in the dependencies in view of the presence of the two sets of claims. New claims 11-20 are supported by the application as filed, in fact by the same portions of the application that support claims 1-10. Attention is directed to method described with respect to steps 1-7 described from page 8, line 21 through page 12, line 2. Additionally, attention is directed to page 12, lines 6-10, page 13, lines 2-7 and 11-17. Further, the disclosure from page 13, line 19 provides support for the specific materials of the dependent claims. Four specific examples appear in the patent application from pages 22-30 that fully support the added claims.

Of the examined claims, claim 1 was rejected as unpatentable over Chun (U.S. Patent 6,486,058) in view of Shinogi et al. (U.S. Patent 6,479,900, hereinafter Shinogi). Claim 2 was subjected to the same rejection in combination with Rokugawa (U.S. Patent 6,434,819), and claims 3 and 6 were rejected over that combination of three references and further in view of Tomlin et al. (U.S. Patent 5,773,546, hereinafter Tomlin). In other words, all of the rejections depend upon the asserted combination of Chun and Shinogi. The rejection is respectfully traversed because the rejection is legally erroneous.

The present patent application was filed in the United States on December 18, 2000, claiming the priority of a Japanese patent application filed March 31, 2000. Chun was filed in the United States on October 4, 2000 and that filing date is its effective date for prior art purposes. It is apparent that the effective date of Chun is subsequent to the date of the filing of the priority application from which the present U.S. patent application claims priority. Thus, upon perfection of the priority claim of the present patent application, Chun must be withdrawn as prior art.

Pursuant to 37 CFR 1.55, Applicants perfect and claim the priority of their Japanese patent application by attaching certified English language translation of the Japanese patent application. The translation demonstrates that, as required, the claims of

Japanese patent application. The translation demonstrates that, as required, the claims of the present patent application have the support required by 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, in the Japanese patent application. Thus, Chun is removed as prior art and the rejection of the examined claims 1-3 and 6 must be withdrawn and those claims should now be allowed. Since, as noted, claim 1 is a generic claim, upon withdrawal of the rejection of claim 1, claims 4, 5, and 7-10 should be rejoined to the prosecution. Thus, claims 1-10 should now be allowed and, in view of common features of claims 1-10 and claims 11-20, claims 11-20 should be allowed as well.

No examined claim has been amended in response to the Office Action. Accordingly, if the Examiner makes a new rejection based upon newly cited prior art or a different legal ground, that rejection cannot properly be a final rejection.

Reconsideration and favorable action are earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Jeffrey A. Wyand, Reg. No. 29,458
LEYDIG, VOIT & MAYER
700 Thirteenth Street, N.W., Suite 300
Washington, DC 20005-3960
(202) 737-6770 (telephone)
(202) 737-6776 (facsimile)

Date: Sept 23, 2003
JAW:ves